

## REMARKS

### Status of the Claims

- Claims 1-4, 6-11 and 13-19 are pending in the Application after entry of this amendment.
- Claims 1-4, 6-11 and 13-19 are rejected by the Examiner.

### Claim Rejections Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-11, and 13-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,216,185 to Chu in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Chu discloses a personal computer system comprising two physically separate units and the interconnection between them. As stated in Chu col. 2 lines 37-43:

“The first unit, an attached computing module (ACM), contains the core computing power and environment for a computer user. The second unit, a peripheral console (PCON), contains the power supply and primary input and output devices for the computer system. An ACM and a PCON are coupled with one another to form a fully functional personal computer system.” (Chu, col. 2, lines 37-43)

Further, Chu teaches:

“The PCON provides the remaining components of a personal computer system including substantial power supply and input/output devices. *Different PCON designs provide different usage possibilities for the user's core computing power and environment.* Example PCON's include desktop computer, notebook computer, notepad computer, and computer-based entertainment computer designs.

*To form a fully operational computer system, an ACM is coupled with a PCON.* The plug-in module design of the ACM, and the concentration of high-value components therein (both in terms of high-value hardware and high-value files), makes it easy for a user to transport the high-value core between multiple PCON's, each of which can enjoy a relatively low cost.” (col. 2, line 63- col. 3 line 9)

Applicant submits that one of skill in the art would interpret the teachings of Chu above to indicate that the PCON provides usage possibilities for the user's core computer and that a fully operational computer system requires the mating of an ACM with a PCON. Yet, Claim 1 indicates that the docking station (analogized to Chu PCON) can be functional without the use of the computer core. Thus, Chu teaches away from the claimed invention because Chu requires that an ACM be installed before a fully operational computer system is realized.

Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) is a smart display unit initially developed by Microsoft®. As stated in paragraph 0002 of the present application, a smart display is a wireless, touch screen monitor that lets you access and use a personal computer, such as a home computer, in a wireless local area network fashion. Such display devices allow remote access to a personal or business computer to allow the full use of the computer while away from the personal computer's fixed location. Users may perform such functions as connecting to the Internet, checking e-mail messages, downloading files and using other applications such as photo editing, money management, and CD ROM burning programs. A smart display may extend the power of the Windows XP Professional™ operating system and allow the user the mobility to travel anywhere within the wireless range of the smart display and still utilize the personal computer that has a fixed location. As such, the smart display is designed to operate without a substantial, full function computer core.

The Office Action dated 12/21/06 on page 3 states:

"Chu fails to teach that the docking station enables the communication interface to acquire the information of the external computer and to display the information when the mobile computer is both uninstalled and without communications with the docking station. AAPA teaches a display device which is absent a mobile computer which enables a communication interface to support communication with at least one external computer (See present specification Paragraph 002). It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to combine the teachings of the AAPA with that of Chu...” (Office Action, page 3)

Applicant agrees that Chu fails to teach the Claim 1 element “wherein the docking station ... enables the communication interface to acquire the information of the external computer and to display the information when the mobile computer is both uninstalled and without communications with the docking station...”. However, Applicant does not agree that one of skill in the art would combine the teachings of Chu and AAPA.

Chu does not suggest that a PCON has functionality to communicate with an external computer when the computer core is not installed. In fact, Chu, as indicated above requires that a computer core be installed before the system becomes fully operational. Stated another way, the PCON of Chu fails to exhibit any functionality independently of the computer core ACM; Chu requires that the ACM be installed before any functionality is realized. Thus, Chu teaches away from operation of the PCON without a computer core. Claim 1 recites functionality without a computer core.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that one of skill in the art would not be motivated to combine Chu and AAPA because Chu actually teaches away from the invention of Claim 1. As such, any reference combined with Chu continues to teach away from the claimed invention. Independent Claim 10 has similar aspects to that of Claim 1 and is similarly distinguished from the cited combination. Since the motivation to combine references is a necessary element of a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 USC §103 per MPEP §2143, and the motivation to combine Chu and AAPA is absent, then Applicant respectfully suggests that no prima facie case of obviousness is made on Claims 1-4, 6, 8-11, and 13-14. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of Claims 1-4, 6, 8-11, and 13-14 because these claims patentably define over the cited art.

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,216,185 to Chu in view of Applicant’s Admitted Prior Art. (AAPA) and in further view of U.S. Pat No. 6,285,911 to Watts, Jr. et al. (Watts). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As stated above with respect to the independent Claims 1 and 10, the combination of Chu and AAPA fail to establish a prima facie case of obviousness due to lack of motivation to combine. Applicant submits that the addition of Watts does not change that result.

Therefore Applicant submits that the combination of Chu, AAPA, and Watts fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. Applicant therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of Claim 7 patentably defines over the cited combination.

Claims 15-18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,216,185 to Chu in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art. (AAPA) and in further view of U.S. Pat No. 6,342,901 to Adler et al. (Adler). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As stated above with respect to the independent Claims 1 and 10, the combination of Chu and AAPA fail to establish a prima facie case of obviousness due to lack of motivation to combine. Applicant submits that the addition of Adler does not change that result.

Therefore Applicant submits that the combination of Chu, AAPA, and Adler fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. Applicant therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of Claims 15-18 because these claims patentably define over the cited art.

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,216,185 to Chu in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art. (AAPA) and in further view of U.S. Pat. Publication No. US2002/0065902 to Janik et al. (Janik). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

As stated above with respect to the independent Claims 1 and 10, the combination of Chu and AAPA fail to establish a prima facie case of obviousness due to lack of motivation to combine. Applicant submits that the addition of Janik does not change that result.

Therefore Applicant submits that the combination of Chu, AAPA, and Janik fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness. Applicant therefore respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of Claim 19 because this claim patentably defines over the cited art.

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-1973/304061.1  
**Application No.:** 10/621,286  
**Office Action Dated:** December 21, 2006

**PATENT**

**Conclusion**

In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection and request reconsideration because the pending claims patentably define over the cited art.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 21, 2007

/Jerome G. Schaefer/

---

Jerome G. Schaefer  
Registration No. 50,800

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor  
Philadelphia PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439